

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,743	03/24/2004	John Armstrong	EFIM0581	5863
22862 GLENN PATE	7590 10/16/200 ENT GROUP	EXAMINER		
	WAY, SUITE L	CHEEMA, UMAR		
MENLO PAR	K, CA 94025		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2444		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/16/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

eptomatters@glenn-law.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)					
10/808,743	ARMSTRONG ET AL.					
Examiner	Art Unit					
UMAR CHEEMA	2444					

	UMAR CHEEMA	2444	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 15 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following i application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing 	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (1)	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date whave been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of exhausted the form of the expiration date of the set for this (b) above, if checked, Any reply re-evel-duty her Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic e of the final rejection, e	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as en if timely filed,
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They raise the least of the second results in the second results of the second re	sideration and/or search (see NO) v);	ΓE below);	
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or 	er form for appeal by materially rec	aucing or simplifying tr	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 		mpliant Amendment (f	PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 			
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•	
7. Solution For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		I be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1.3.5-8 and 11-13</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
13. Other:			
/William C. Vaughn, Jr./ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,3, 58, and 11-13 have been considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Ceoth US Patent No. 6,58,832 was not invented "by another" as required by 35 USC 102(e) and therefore by submitting an affidavit 37 CFR 1,132 from the assignee of the application, dedering that the claims pending in the instant application and the claims issued in Geoth were invented by the same inventor. It is examiner's position that although affidavits or declarations submitted for the purpose of establishing that the reference disclose applicant's invention are properly lifed under 37 CFR 1,132, rather than 37 CFR 1,131, such affidivats submitted improperly under 37 CFR 1,131 will be considered as though they were filled under 37 CFR 1,131 to traverse a ground of rejection. In re Facius, 408 E.2d 1396, fall USPQ 294 (CCPA 1969). It is Examiner's position that 37 CFR 1,132 affidivit is not sufficient to overcome the applied rejection under 35 U.S.C 102(e).